

mending him for a higher grade. That is where the power of the Minister, under the old law, came in. I say that this principle, enunciated to-day, is a bad one for the civil service, and also for the Ministers. It will be taken throughout the country as a warning for civil servants to get political influence to work, or for politicians to bring influence to have their friends in the service given higher salaries.

But my hon. friend, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, said: Oh, this thing was getting too bulky, and it ought to be brought down. Is there no other way of bringing it down? I take my hon. friends opposite as witnesses. What have they been saying for the last fifteen years? They have been saying that there are too many civil servants in the departments, that they are tumbling over one another. I can tell you how hon. gentlemen could decrease the sum total paid without resorting to the means they have taken. They could do so by not filling the vacancies when they occur. A large proportion of vacancies occur every year, and if these hon. gentlemen were true to their convictions of a few years ago, and when an officer, for any reason, went out of office, let the office lapse, they could effect a saving greater than any they will make by the means they have taken. But my hon. friend did not give the past Government the credit he should. We took the very best means of reducing the cost of the civil service. Where was the chief difficulty? It was where my hon. friend said it was, that second-class and first-class and chief clerks were not too highly paid, and that there was a great deal of work done by first-class clerks which was really writer's work, the wages for which went up to a thousand dollars. Two years ago we introduced a Bill, which is to-day the law, by which no more third-class clerks were to be appointed. In their stead we appointed writers, who begin at a minimum of \$300 and go to a maximum of \$600, and did writer's work. In the natural course, the expenditure, under that system, would be very materially reduced, and the work just as well done, while the higher grades would be kept up to their present proportions.

I tell you what you are doing. The young men who have come into the service, and are the best class of men for the service, and who to-day have some hope that their conscientious labours will not go unrewarded—many of those men, with their growing families, who have been living economically on the basis that each year they can afford just a little more expenditure, because they will get the \$50 increase, buoyed up by the hope of this increase, this year find it suddenly cut off; and I know, of my own experience, of men whose obligations, pared down to the utmost limit of economy, under their expectations, have to-day to look to a deficit of \$50 and borrow the money to meet obligations incurred under the expectation of

getting that increase. We cannot afford to demoralize our civil service. I put it to the Ministers generally, not from a partisan point of view, whether they are starting out in the right course by taking away the statutory increase from the deserving, and leaving it to the Minister alone to recommend that it be given to whomever he chooses. After all, Ministers are only mortal, and many of them are dependent on certain persons in their own department for forming their ideas, and thus they often get their impressions of the people under them from parties who are interested in making certain impressions on the Minister's mind. I ask them to think it over, whether or not it is not better to proceed on that principle of sweeping away the regular and permanent increase and making it simply dependent on the will of the Minister himself.

My hon. friend, the Minister of Interior (Mr. Sifton), has escaped criticism of his department, because the criticism was drawn away to the civil service generally, but he must not think that his department is not open to criticism, as he has explained its management. This Minister is only three or four months in office, yet he goes to work and assumes to know what are the qualifications of the fifty, sixty or eighty men who are in his department. I say that that is absolutely impossible. I entered my department with a good deal of young vigour and tried to get acquainted with the persons in it and measure their services, and I did not feel I was competent to do so when I had been there three or six months or even longer, and I think others will bear me out in that view. But this Minister had been there only four months, when he made up his mind as to who were deserving of \$200 or \$250 increase and who should not get any increase. It would have been better if the Minister had taken at least a year to make himself thoroughly acquainted with his department before attempting to gauge and measure the employees of his department, and from eighty or more single out four for preferment and increase and leave the others as they were. My hon. friend removed Mr. Burgess—because, no doubt, it was a removal, a degradation. Mr. Burgess was appointed by the hon. gentleman's own friends and was thoroughly acquainted with the working of the department. Though not a political friend of my own, he is a friend of mine in a general way. I have come in contact with him, and I know that as Deputy Minister of that department he proved himself always a man who thoroughly understood his work.

But my hon. friend shoves him aside after he has been there three months, or rather two months—and I believe he wanted to do it before he had been there three weeks. If rumour is correct, he did so. He fought a hard battle, and rather had a reverse, the story goes; but he insisted as an insistent Minister can, and carried his point, as an